EXHIBIT 14

	Page 1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
4	
5	IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE CASE NO.
	ANTITRUST LITIGATION 3:21-md-02981-JD
6	
	THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:
7	
8	Match Group, LLC et al., v. Google LLC et al.,
	Case No. 3:22-cv-02746-JD
9	Fining Company Transport Control II Control
10	Epic Games Inc. v. Google LLC et al., Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD
11	Case No. 3:20-CV-05/61-JD
12	In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust
12	Litigation, Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD
13	Elelgacion, case No. 3.20 CV 03701 0D
14	In re Google Play Developer Antitrust
	Litigation, Case No. 3:20-cv-05792-JD
15	
	State of Utah et al. v. Google LLC et al.,
16	Case No. 3:21-cv-05227-JD
17	
18	***HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - UNDER PROTECTIVE ORDER***
19	REMOTE PROCEEDINGS OF THE
20	VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF SAMEER SAMAT
21	TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2022
22	
23	
24	REPORTED BY KIMBERLY EDELEN,
	CSR. NO. 9042, CRR, RPR.
25	

	Page 2
1	REMOTE PROCEEDINGS OF THE VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF
2	SAMEER SAMAT, TAKEN ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFFS, AT
3	1:04 P.M. PST, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2022, BEFORE
4	KIMBERLY A. EDELEN, CSR NO. 9042, CRR, RPR.
5	RIMBERDI A. EDEDEN, COR NO. 9042, CRR, RFR.
6	REMOTE APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL
7	
	FOR MATCH GROUP, LLC; HUMOR RAINBOW, INC.;
8	PLENTYOFFISH MEDIA ULC; AND PEOPLE MEDIA:
	HUESTON HENNIGAN LLP
9	BY: DOUGLAS J. DIXON, ESQ.
	JULIA L. HAINES, ESQ.
10	620 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE
	SUITE 1300
11	NEWPORT BEACH, CALIFORNIA 92660
	949.229.8640
12	DDIXON@HUESTON.COM
	JHAINES@HUESTON.COM
13	
14	
	FOR EPIC GAMES, INC.
15	(IN EPIC GAMES, INC. V. GOOGLE LLC, ET AL.):
	CRAVATH SWAINE & MOORE, LLP
16	BY: DANIEL L. OTTAUNICK, ESQ.
	825 8TH AVENUE
17	NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10019
	212.474.1687
18	DOTTAUNICK@CRAVATH.COM
19	
20	FOR PROPOSED CLASS IN RE: GOOGLE PLAY CONSUMER
	ANTITRUST LITIGATION:
21	KOREIN TILLERY LAW OFFICES
	BY: DAVID WALCHAK, ESQ.
22	205 NORTH MICHIGAN AVENUE SUITE 1950
23	CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60601
23	312.641.9750
24	DWALCHAK@KOREINTILLERY.COM
25	(REMOTE APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)
	(

	Page 3
1	REMOTE APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL (CONTINUED)
2	
3	FOR GOOGLE LLC, ET AL.:
	MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
4	BY: BRIAN C. ROCCA, ESQ.
_	LEIGHA BECKMAN, ESQ.
5	ONE MARKET, SPEAR STREET TOWER 28TH FLOOR
6	SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105
	415.442.1000
7	BRIAN.ROCCA@MORGANLEWIS.COM
	LEIGHA.BECKMAN@MORGANLEWIS.COM
8	
9	
	INTERIM CO-LEAD CLASS COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFFS AND
10	PROPOSED CLASS IN IN RE GOOGLE PLAY CONSUMER
	ANTITRUST LITIGATION:
11	BARTLIT BECK, LLP
	BY: KARMA M. GIULIANELLI, ESQ.
12	1801 WEWATTA STREET
	SUITE 1200
13	DENVER, COLORADO 80202
	303.592.3165
14	KARMA.GIULIANELLI@BARTLIT-BECK.COM
15	
16	FOR THE STATE OF TENNESSEE:
	TENNESSEE OFFICE OF THE
17	ATTORNEY GENERAL
	BY: S. ETHAN BOWERS, ESQ.
18	P.O. BOX 20207
	NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37202
19	ETHAN.BOWERS@AG.TN.GOV
20	
21	ALSO PRESENT: JEFREE ANDERSON, VIDEOGRAPHER
22	KATHLYN QUERUBIN, GOOGLE
23	STEPHEN MYERS, MATCH GROUP
24	JEANETTE TECKMAN, MATCH GROUP
25	

	Page 7
1	REMOTE PROCEEDINGS
2	TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2022; 1:04 P.M. PST
3	
4	
5	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good afternoon. We're
6	going on the record at 1:04 p.m. on November 8th,
7	2022.
8	Please note that this deposition is being
9	conducted virtually. Audio and video recording will
10	continue to take place unless all parties agree to
11	go off the record.
12	This is Media Unit 1 of the video-recorded
13	deposition of Sameer Samat taken by counsel for
L 4	plaintiff in the matter of In Re Google Play Store
15	Antitrust Litigation versus Google Incorporated,
16	et al., filed in the United States District Court,
17	Northern District of California, Case
18	No. 3:22-cv-02746-JD.
19	This deposition is being conducted remotely
20	using virtual technology. My name is
21	Jefree Anderson representing Veritext and I'm the
22	videographer. The court reporter is Kimberly Edelen
23	from the firm Veritext.
24	All appearances are noted on the record,
25	and the witness can be sworn in.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL		
Page 105		
language is used. Again, we did have to literally		
change the words in order to clarify the policy, so		
that may be why.		
Q And prior to the announcement in September		
of 2020, fair to say that Google had been discussing		
this clarification or change for several years?		
A We had been discussing the clarification as		
developers had pointed to our existing language and		
suggested that there might be loopholes. We had		
then tried to clarify with them privately that those		
were not, in fact, the intention of the language.		
But because of the continual insistence		
that that's what the language really meant, we		
decided to clarify.		
Q And those discussions started back at least		
as early as 2017, right?		
A I don't remember precisely, but it wouldn't		
surprise me.		
Q And one of the reasons that Google waited		
to announce the policy for several years was because		
Google was worried about blowback from developers		
and regulators and the media over the announcement		
of such a change or clarification, correct?		

MR. ROCCA: Objection. Form.

	Page 206
1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
2	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES) ss.
3	
4	I, Kimberly A. Edelen, C.S.R. No. 9042, in and
5	for the State of California, do hereby certify:
6	That prior to being examined, the witness named
7	in the foregoing deposition was by me duly sworn to
8	testify the truth, the whole truth and nothing but
9	the truth;
10	That said deposition was taken down by me in
11	shorthand at the time and place therein named, and
12	thereafter reduced to typewriting under my
13	direction, and the same is a true, correct and
14	complete transcript of said proceedings;
15	That if the foregoing pertains to the original
16	transcript of a deposition in a Federal Case, before
17	completion of the proceedings, review of the
18	transcript { } was {X} was not requested.
19	I further certify that I am not interested in
20	the event of the action.
21	Witness my hand this 9th day of November,
22	2022.
23	Kinhel 281
24	
	KIMBERLY A. EDELEN, C.S.R. NO. 9042
25	